MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
February 20, 1968

INDEX

	Page
I. CONVENE	
II. ADMINISTRATION	
1. Dates of Next Meeting	1
2. Approval of Minutes of January 1968 Meeting	1
3. Budget Hearings Fiscal 1969	1
4. Design of Medals	1-2
5. Jefferson Memorial, Pool and Fountain	2
III. LEGISLATION	
H.R.15083	2
IV. SUBMISSIONS	
1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections	
a. American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building	2-3
b. S.L.68-35, National Academy of Science Auditorium and Parking Lot	3
c. S.L. 68-33, Addn to Chesapeake and Potomac Communications Center	3
d. S.L. 68-34, Add Canopy to Existing Penthouse Roof (Watergate East)	3-4
e. Appendix 1	4
f. Appendix 2	4
g. O.G.68-157, 2901 M St., N.W.-Market and Theater	4
2. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic South Portal and Approaches to Inner Loop Center Leg Tunnel	4-5
3. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Washington Subway System	
a. 12th and G Sts., N.W. Transfer Station	5
b. Concept for Aerial Stations	
4. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings & Grounds	
a. Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas St.,NE	5
b. Capitol East Playground and Natatorium	6
c. Fort Dupont Swimming Pool	6
d. Warehouse and Shops Building	
5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development NIH	7

6. American Battle Monuments Commission
Proposed Selection of Everett Du Pen as sculptor for Utah Beach Memorial 7

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C.Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections
American Inst. of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design 7-8

2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
Washington Subway System
a. 12th and G Sts Transfer Station 8
b. Concept for Aerial Stations 8

3. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Insp.
a. National Academy of Science Auditorium and Parking Lot 8-9
b. Addn to Chesapeake and Potomac Comm Center 8

4. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic
South Portal and Approaches to Inner Loop Center Leg Tunnel 9-10

5. General Services Administration, Public Bldgs. Svc
National Inst. of Child Health and Human Dev.,NIH 10

6. D.C. Govt., Department of Buildings and Grounds
a. Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas St., NE 10
b. Capitol East Playground and Natatorium 11
c. Fort Dupont Swimming Pool 11
d. Warehouse and Shops Building, Main Water Pumping Station 11

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on February 20, 1968. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:15 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Aline Saarinen
Chloethiel Woodard Smith
John Walker

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald B. Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Research Analyst
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Donald Jackson

Recorder: Arnold Cohn

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting

Tuesday - Wednesday, 19-20 March 1968 were approved. Tuesday-Wednesday, 16-17 April were tentatively selected for the following month.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 1968 Meeting

Approved unanimously.

3. Budget Hearings Fiscal 1969

The Secretary reported that Budget Hearings were scheduled for March 8th and 11th before the Senate and House Appropriation Sub-Committees.

4. Design of Medals (Added)

Mr. Walker reported on a discussion of designs of medals with the Secretary of the Treasury who favors the Commission's idea of establishing a design procedure similar to that used by the Post Office Dept. for designing stamps. Based on that method, a Citizens Committee on Medals, appointed by the Secretary, could suggest both subject and artist for the medal and then review the design. The Secretary would have the final decision. Mr. Walker suggested that the design of all currency also be considered.

The members agreed to draft procedures for the design of medals and currency, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

5. Jefferson Memorial, Pool and Fountain (Added)

The Chairman explained that a pool with jets was proposed for the south side of the Jefferson Memorial. Funds had been donated for the project through White House "Beautification" efforts. The Commission's advice was requested.

The members had no objection to the concept, but suggested Farragut Square or Judiciary Square be considered as alternate and more appropriate sites.

The project was submitted informally.

III. LEGISLATION

H.R. 15083-2/5/68-Mr.McMillan=90thC

To encourage and assist private industry to provide needed new parking facilities, employment opportunities, and housing units, and a strengthened and expanded tax base in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, pursuant to skyline studies for the National Capital Planning Commission in 1964, and parking studies for the Bureau of the Budget to provide needed parking facilities in the District of Columbia.

EXHIBIT A

The Secretary stated that the proposed legislation included raising the possible height of buildings to 230 feet and the FAR ratio to 20. Private enterprise would be permitted to build parking facilities on Federal property under the direction of the Redevelopment Land Agency.

The members opposed the bill which they considered poorly conceived, overly inclusive and sadly negligent of the values of Washington's skyline traditions.

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

The Secretary presented and reviewed the following projects.

1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design by Mitchell and Giurgola, architects.

Sketches submitted indicated a lowering of height to 70 feet. The facade had horizontal window bands on the upper floors and solid

glass on the two lower floors.

The members considered the change in mass more compatible with the Octagon House and garden which had been overshadowed in the original scheme. The facade continued to have an unresolved combination of current cliches.

Final action was withheld until the conference with the architect.

b. S.L. 68-35, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., National Academy of Science Auditorium and Parking Lot - Proposed Design by Harrison and Abramovitz, architects.

The model and working drawings presented plans for construction of the last phase of the original design by Bertram G. Goodhue. Parking facilities had been added. Additional parking spaces were provided along the ramps leading to the underground garage which would be visible from the C Street entrance to the State Department. Existing materials and details were to be continued on the addition.

The members considered the solution to the parking requirements satisfactory and approved the proposed plans with the recommendation that the ramps be screened by trees or shrubs.

A conference with the architect was considered unnecessary.

c. S.L. 68-33, 30 E Street, S.W., Addition to Chesapeake and Potomac Communications Center - Proposed Design by Chatelain, Gauger and Nolan, architects.

A model and working drawings were submitted for a limestone addition to an existing utility structure which houses mechanical equipment for the Bell Telephone Company. As background information the Secretary commented that the Commission had taken no action on the original design submitted after the building was under construction. Had the original been submitted according to procedures, it would not have been approved since the relation of the building to the site appeared awkward. The Telephone Company anticipated a future addition of 25 feet on top of the entire mass.

The members commented on the lack of architectural unity. They felt they could not possibly approve the design and continue the error.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

d. S.L. 68-34, 2500 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Add Canopy to Existing Penthouse Roof (Watergate East).

The Commission was requested to approve an individual apartment owner's proposal to add a canopy to the roof structure of the

Watergate apartments. Approval would undoubtedly lead to other requests of this type. The Commission has continually tried to keep the roof structures of the Watergate Development to a minimum.

The members disapproved the request. The Department of Licenses and Inspections was informed of the Commission's action.

e. Appendix 1-Shipstead-Luce Act Submissions

There was no objection to recommendations by the staff on the Shipstead-Luce applications listed on Appendix 1. EXHIBIT B

f. Appendix 2-Old Georgetown Act Submissions

There was no objection to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT C

1332-29th Street (Listed as O.G. 68-147 on Appendix 2)
Proposed Addition to a House

In a separate action the members confirmed the Old Georgetown Architectural Board's disapproval of additions to the house which would obscure its original character.

g. O.G. 68-157, 2901 M Street, N.W. - Proposed design for Market and Theater.

The members supported unanimously the Board's disapproval of the design for a Safeway Market and Theater at the terminus of the Pennsylvania Avenue axis.

The Commission's disapproval was reporte d to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

2. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

South Portal and Approaches to Inner Loop Center Leg Tunnel - Proposed Design by Wright and Gane, architects.

Drawings and a sample of material indicated a change in design for that portion of the freeway system which tunnels the Mall at the foot of the Capitol. The dark red granite blocks arranged in a rip rap pattern were the antitheses of the light granite, formal-size panels used in the north entrance.

The members considered the material inappropriate for the area of the Capitol. They reiterated that the freeway design should have unity throughout the system in material and details.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect and officials of the Highway Department later.

3. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Washington Subway System designed by Harry Weese and Associates, architects.

a. 12th and G Streets, N.W. Transfer Station

b. Concept for Aerial Stations (Rhode Island Avenue on B&O right of way)

Color renderings of both stations and definitive drawings were submitted with a model of the prototype station for all surface areas.

The members approved the design for the interchange station which was a right angle juncture of two proto-type tube stations.

The aerial stations had a double-arched sculptural concrete roof. Glass screens spaced along the platform provided protection from the weather. A lighting trough formed the edge of the glass roof apron.

The members commented on the abrupt perpendicular line of the glass apron. They felt that the natural curve of the arch should be uninterrupted.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect and officials of the transit authority later.

4. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas St., N.E. - Revised Design by Metcalf and Associates, architects.

The members felt the exterior design was improved. They commented on the confusion of interior circulation between the kitchen and all purpose room.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

The Chairman commented on recent criticism that the schools are functionally obsolete when they are built. Though the Commission has worked to improve massing, relationship of elements and aesthetics of schools, he requested the members to study the problem of interior functional requirements. The solution might require a discussion of the problem with the Board of Education.

The members commented that although the plans presented to the Commission had little flexibility they are based on the program requirements presented to the architect by the Board of Education.

b. Capitol East Playground and Natatorium, Seventh Street and North Carolina Ave., S.E. - Proposed design by Eugene A. Delmar, architect.

Planned as four linked, windowless cubes, the structure would contain two interior pools and community rooms. The Secretary stated that the architect felt that "breaking up the masses" helped to blend it in with the neighborhood composed of small brick row houses.

The members considered the building too complicated and too oppressive. The project provided an opportunity for the architect to develop a singular design which reflected the interior function and had some spirit of a recreational building.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

c. Fort Dupont Swimming Pool - Proposed Design by Victor Smolen and Associates, architects.

The design was similar to one previously approved for the Upshur Swimming Pool.

The members considered their previous approval applying only to that design which was not submitted as a possible prototype. They felt the design submitted at this meeting had no relation to its purpose and location.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

d. Warehouse and Shops Building, Main Water Pumping Station, 2nd and Bryant Streets, N.W. - Proposed Design by S. Thomas Stathes, architect.

Preliminary drawings and a model showed a design for a warehouse, machine shop and parking structure which attempted to blend it in with the adjacent main pumping station. A flanking hill provided a screen for the building on the north. The one floor structure with parking on the roof would have another floor added in the future.

The members questioned the need for the arches which resembled those on the old pumping station. The relation of the plan to the dormitories of Howard University adjacent to the site was also mentioned.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect later.

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design by The Architects Collaborative, Inc.

A model and perspective views indicated a reinforced concrete building which conforms to the approved NIH Master Plan. A three level parking garage was planned adjacent to the proposed structure which varied slightly from the Master Plan, but served to consolidate elements and clean up the site.

Detailed discussion and final action were withheld until a conference with the architect later.

6. American Battle Monuments Commission

Proposed Selection of Everett Du Pen as sculptor for Utah Beach Memorial.

Reviewing photographs of the work of Everett Du Pen, sculptor, the members considered the proposed sculptor inadequate to design a large bronze bas-relief for the inner surface of the curved walls. Mr. Roszak commented that the sculptural quality of the design for the memorial was greater than that reflected in photographs of the sculptor's work.

The Commission asked the Secretary to find out more about the work to be executed and whether or not Thiry had worked with this sculptor before. EXHIBIT D

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

Mr. Nes and Mr. Scheick representing the AIA and Mr. Giurgola, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Giurgola described the plan for two rectangular wings connected by a glass enclosed well. To avoid a rhythm which might conflict with the Octagon House, two fenestration patterns were introduced. Horizontally slotted windows were used for the upper fllors office area and solid glass for the lower two floors which contained exhibit space, auditorium, etc. While studies of exterior materials had not been completed, the

building was essentially a concrete structure.

Expressing the members' views Mrs. Smith stated that the location and scale were improved. Emphasizing the garden which separated the old building from the new was desirable, she continued stating that the Commission approved the basic location, massing and height of the building. More information on exterior design and materials was necessary.

In a general discussion the members recommended that some motifs of the design should be eliminated and others strengthened and suggested that either gray concrete or granite be considered for exterior material. The transcripts of the discussion are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT E

The Commission's approval in general of the location, massing and height of building was forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections with a request that details be restudied and a greater degree of unity be reflected in the exterior design. EXHIBIT F

2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Washington Subway System

Mr. Harry Weese, architect, and representatives of the Transit Authority attended the meeting.

a. 12th and G Streets Transfer Station

The Chairman expressed the members' unanimous approval of the design for the interchange station.

Mr. Weese reported that an octagon or hexagon shaped dark-brown tile was planned for the floor.

b. Concept for Aerial Stations (Rhode Island Ave. on the B&O right of way)

Mr. Bunshaft lead the discussion stating that the perpendicular drop at the outer edge of the roof should be eliminated and that the twin arches have uniform spring lines. The columns should be rectangular and not diagonal in plan. The transcripts are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT G

The Commission's approval of the transfer station and recommendations for the aerial station were forwarded with the transcripts to the Transit Authority. EXHIBIT G

3. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. S.L. 68-35, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., National Academy of Science Auditorium and Parking Lot - Proposed Design

Dr. Frederick Seitz of the National Academy of Science and

Mr. Wallace Harrison, architect, attended the meeting.

The Chairman expressed the Commission's approval and reported an effort had been made to contact Mr. Harrison before his departure for the meeting informing him of the Commission's approval.

Mr. Harrison remarked that Dan Kiley, would be consulted on landscape plans which would follow the original idea of setting the building in a grove of trees. This would help to hide the parking ramps.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

b. S.L. 68-33, 30 E Street, S.W., Addition to Chesapeake and Potomac Communications Center - Proposed Design

Mr. Mothersaid of the Telephone Company and Mr. Gauger, architect, attended the meeting.

Stating the Commission's unanimous disapproval, Mr. Bunshaft commented on the lack of architectural design in the proposed building. He stressed that the site near the Capitol required unified design. He requested that the addition be redesigned and presented with indication of the ultimate size.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

4. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

South Portal and Approaches to Inner Loop Center Leg Tunnel - Proposed Design

Mr. Grady representing the Highway Department and Mr. Wright, architect, attended the meeting.

Justifying the dark-brown granite block and its intricate pattern of small squares, both Mr. Grady and Mr. Wright stated that the South portal received greater sunlight and required a darker shade of granite to reduce the glare. They felt the proposed pattern was more compatible with the natural setting and accommodated the changes in grade and curvature of the walls. The standard highway lighting feature was considered but a final decision had not been made.

The Chairman stated that the Commission was concerned with the lack of unity in the design of the freeway system and especially in this area near the Capitol. He reported the Commission's disapproval of the granite blocks and urged that a careful study be made of the lighting for this site.

Mr. Bunshaft commented that the previously approved standard material

used in vertical strips could accommodate curves. To lessen the glare a heavier textured granite could be used. He reiterated the Chairman's statement concerning the lack of unity in the design.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Highways and Traffic. EXHIBIT H

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design

Mr. L. L. Hunter of Public Buildings Service and Mr. Norman Fletcher of the Architects Collaborative, Inc., attended the meeting.

Mr. Fletcher explained the plans for the building and discussed two solutions for parking 650 cars. One scheme for on-site parking divided the lots into three parking areas separated by green wedges. The other scheme has a three-level garage with two levels partially underground and a top section planned as a landscaped parking area.

In reply to the members' questions pertaining to the parking structure, Mr. Fletcher stated that another floor would obstruct the view of the proposed building and a lower third floor would be too costly.

The members suggested increasing the two levels so all parking could be within the structure and the entire top level landscaped as part of the NIH campus.

The Chairman expressed the Commission's approval of the Child Health and Human Development building. The architect agreed to study the parking problems applying the Commission's suggestions.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service. EXHIBIT I

6. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Mr. Purcell, Department of Buildings and Grounds attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas St., N.E.-Revised Design

Mr. Metcalf, architect, attended the meeting.

Mrs. Smith expressed the Commission's approval of mass and exterior design of the revised plan and concern for the interior circulation plan. The relation of the main entrance to the kitchen and all purpose room across the hall wasn't clear and detracted from the plan of the school. Mr. Bunshaft stated that the interior circulation plan should be restudied.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT J

b. Capitol East Playground and Natatorium, Seventh Street and South Carolina Ave., S.E. - Proposed Design

Mr. Delmar, architect, attended the meeting.

Mrs. Saarinen spoke for the Commission stating that the architect had "missed a marvelous opportunity" to design a structure which expressed its purpose. The four "badly related boxes" didn't reflect any idea of a swimming pool. The project should be redesigned "in terms of a bright beautiful structure" which enhances and conforms to the neighborhood.

Mrs. Smith continued the Commission's criticism stating that the project is for a delightful pleasant activity yet the design of the building was stern and did not attract people to it.

The Chairman stated the Commission's disapproval which was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT J

c. Fort Dupont Swimming Pool - Proposed Design

Mr. Smolen, architect, attended the meeting.

The Chairman commented on the "18th Century" appearance which was inappropriate to the setting and recommended that the exterior treatment be restudied.

Mr. Purcell was willing to restudy the exterior design.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT J

d. Warehouse and Shops Building, Main Water Pumping Station, 2nd and Bryant Streets, N.W. - Proposed Design

Mr. States, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Bunshaft expressed the Commission's disapproval stating that the project should be restudied and designed as a simple warehouse with good proportions.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT J

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 15083

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 5, 1968

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

A BILL

To encourage and assist private industry to provide needed new parking facilities, employment opportunities, and housing units, and a strengthened and expanded tax base in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, pursuant to skyline studies for the National Capital Planning Commission in 1964, and parking studies for the Bureau of the Budget to provide needed parking facilities in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 2 of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia", approved June 1, 1910, as amended (36 Stat. 452; sec. 5–405, D.C. Code), is amended by striking the period

EXHIBIT A

at the end thereof and adding the following provisions: "and, except in districts presently zoned R–5–B, R–5–C, R–5–D, Special Purpose, C–2, C–2–B, C–3, C–3–A, C–3–B, C–4, C–M–1, C–M–2, and C–M–3 where, in order to encourage and assist private industry to provide needed new parking facilities, employment opportunities, new housing units, and a strengthened and expanded tax base to meet the crisis of inner city areas, an extreme height of two hundred and thirty feet and a floor area ratio of twenty will be permitted. The historic areas of Georgetown and Capitol Hill shall be preserved and are hereby specifically excluded from these new provisions."

SEC. 2. The first section of the Act establishing the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (60 Stat. 793; sec. 5–703, D.C. Code) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and adding the following provisions:

"(c) The Executive Director is authorized to commence immediately to contract for the construction, alteration, maintenance and operation in connection with local, qualified, free enterprise parking operators to provide parking facilities for the Federal Government, its officers and employees, and for members of the public transacting business with and visiting with the Government, pursuant to the 1962 study by the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administra-

tion, on, above, or below presently owned Federal properties in the District of Columbia as he determines necessary to provide such needed parking facilities.

"(d) The Executive Director is authorized to fix fees for the use of parking facilities provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. The fees fixed for officers and employees of the Federal Government shall be such as to amortize the full costs of construction of such parking facilities. All proceeds from leases, fees, and other charges collected by the Executive Director under this Act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(e) The Executive Director is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act, which shall include, but not be limited to, hours of operation, general administration, management, allocation of parking spaces, and criteria for assignment of parking spaces.

"(f) The Executive Director is authorized to lease parking facilities to carry out the purposes of subsection (c) and to contract with local, experienced, parking operators for the operation of any parking facility. Each such lease and each such contract shall—

"(1) state the amount of the parking fees to be charged users of each facility,

"(2) authorize official Government-owned vehicles

being used for Government business to park without charge,

"(3) authorize the lessee or contractor during specific nonworking hours to permit the public to use the parking facility for reasonable fees and to retain, in whole or in part, the proceeds from such fees,

"(4) require the lessee or contractor to have in force at all times during the period of the lease or contract public liability insurance saving the Government harmless from all damages arising out of the operation of the parking facility, and

"(5) contain such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and, in order to protect the legitimate interests of District citizens, additional property, real or personal, including any rights or interests therein, other than property presently owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, shall not be acquired by purchase, lease, gift, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, to provide such Federal parking facilities as are authorized by subsection (c) of this section."

SEC. 3. This Act shall be cited as "The District of Columbia Parking and Zoning Act of 1968".

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 2/20/68

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
31	1111 Penna. Ave., NW American Security & Trust Co.	2 s-f signs, 16 sq-ft each. Illuminated.
ACTION:	App'd., 1/24/68.	
32	2808 Chesterfield Pl., NW Congr. & Mrs Jos. Resnick	Constr. sauna & dressing bldg.
ACTION:	App'd., 2/8/68.	
33	30 E St., SW C & P Telephone Co.	Addn. to Communications Center.
ACTION:	Disap'd. Request restudy of addn., stressing more suitable arch'l. massing & character, 2/20/68.	
34	2500 Va. Ave., NW Watergate East	Add canopy to exist. penthouse roof.
ACTION:	Disap'd. Proposed canopy would further add to the already cluttered appearance of this bldg's. roof top, 2/20/68.	
35	2101 Const. Ave., NW Nat'l. Academy of Sciences	Addn. to rear of exist. bldg. To be used principally as auditorium. Also it will provide some off. space plus parking space
ACTION:	App'd., 2/20/68.	
36	499 So. Capitol St., SW Marfair Off. Bldg.	Rev. to SL 67-107. Increase height of 8-story off. bldg.
ACTION:	App'd. Request subm. of material sample for app'l., 2/20/68.	

APPENDIX 1

EXHIBIT B

NO SL 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
37	1735 New York Ave., NW American Inst. of Architects	Hqtrs. Bldg. for AIA.

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study. Site plan, massing, & height of bldg. are generally acceptable. Exterior elevations are disap'd. They appear unresolved, especially at the intersection of the 2 wings. Also other elements such as the exaggerated horizontal window bands & the prow-like extensions on the end walls were questioned. Stress a greater degree of unity in design of exterior, 2/20/68.

38	2501 Linnean Ave., NW Mr & Mrs Samuel E. Eastman	5-bedrm. residence. Adjunct 2-car carport; plank & beam.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Request clear indication of exterior materials & also furnish detailed landscape & contour plan showing exist. & proposed grades, 2/20/68.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

FEB 1 2 1968

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
130	3322 Dent Pl., NW Miss Grace S. Lockwood	New residence.
ACTION: Recom'd. Submit brick sample, 1/19/68.		
Inf. 136	1417-34th St., NW Mrs. Petsey Powell	Extend dwell. to incl. southeast corner of house. Flat roof over new section to match that over bedrm.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided wood siding is used & joints match exist. house, 2/[illegible]/68.		
137	1075 Thos. Jeff. St., NW Georgetown Manor	1 d-f, 15.75 sq-ft each face identification plaque & w. i. scroll hanger.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Exist. sign as app'd. in OG 68-102 to be flush mounted only. For hanging sign, complete restudy is necessary, FEB 1 2 1968		
138	3248 N St., NW Leo M. Bernstein	Replace pipe rail on exist. fire escapes. Install new platform to exist. fire escape as required by Bldg. Code.
ACTION: No obj. Suggest elimination of diamond shaped ornaments, 2/[illegible]/68.		
139	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Brick samples: "Man Tan" Standard Size, & "Sunset Blend" Standard Size, both Nat'l. Brick & Supply Co.
ACTION: Disap'd. Suggest restudy of available brick types to closer match United Clay Georgetown Colonial C-70 as app'd. in OG 68-115. Recom. investigation of "Oxfords" or "Selected Common Brick." Also request subm. of complete set of working drawings, per action on OG 68-[illegible], FEB 1 2 1968		
140	2913 M St., NW D. C. Restaurant, Inc.	2 beige canvas awnings. No fixed iron frames or posts.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Design & location of awning inappropriate, FEB 1 2 1968		

EXHIBIT C

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
141	3034 Cambridge Pl., NW Suzanne Walsh	Install 2 iron balconies & 1 stairway from 1st fl. to garden - install 2 doors leading to balcony in place of window - install a 7" metal asbestos flue from base. to roof.

ACTION: No obj. provided scroll work is eliminated as shown on drawing. Suggest placing stair treads inside stringer channels, 2/8/68.

142	1634-32nd St., NW Mrs. Leon Zach	Install lantern at front entr.

ACTION: Recom'd., 2/8/68.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 2/20/68

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
143	3145 P St., NW J. F. Begg Co.	Install one #712-B sturdy lantern on front of house.
ACTION:	No obj., 2/16/68.	
144	3143 P St., NW	Same as OG 68-143.
Inf. 145	3108 "O" St., NW Vestry of Christ Church	Forecourt & garden to Chapel of St. Jude.
ACTION:	No obj. to overall scheme, but request further details on brick, mortar, plaque, & gates as they are developed. Recom. restudy of handrail & awkwardly proportioned steps, 2/16/68.	
146	3236 M St., NW Clydes Restaurant	Alter lower (St. level) facade to match eastern front of 3236 M St., NW
ACTION:	Recom'd. Request that brick be painted to match brick, 2/16/68.	
Inf. 147	1332-29th St., NW Mrs. M. de Montaudouin	Repairs, alterations & addns.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Character of exist. house should be retained--with addns. reinforcing the identity of the exist. house. Suggest that new structure be set back 30" or more from face of present building in order to more clearly articulate the old & the new, & for other arch'l. reasons, 2/20/68.	
148	1805 Wisc. Ave., NW C. C. Glover, III	Add 20' wide by entire length of bldg. to right side of exist. bldg., remove showwindows & part of parapet of exist. bldg. & constr. new facade of br. across both exist. bldg & new addn.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Diversity, scale & character of openings, are not appropriate, 2/20/68.	

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
151	3061 M St., NW I. Shima	1 s-f, 18 sq-ft sign. Non-illuminated plastic ltrs. to replace exist. sign.
ACTION:	No obj., 2/16/68.	
152	1227 Wisc. Ave., NW E. Stuart Lyddane	New store front & relocation of exist. bar.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Proposed design unsuitable for this bldg. & location, 2/20/68.	
153	1612-34th St., NW C. R. Alfred	Install flush-mounted air cond. unit thru wall of so. gable in attic. Paint exposed grille of unit to match exterior wall
ACTION:	No obj., 2/16/68.	
154	3259 P St., NW Col. Russell Skinner	Increase size of kitchen & install lavatory on 1st fl.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Proposal detracts from character of exist. house, 2/20/68.	
155	1068-31st St., NW Mr & Mrs Edwin W. Davis	Permission is requested to occupy 1st fl. as adm. off., & 2nd fl. as caretaker's apt. Code requires 3/4 hour fire rating at exterior & stipulates it may be done with cement plaster stucco.
ACTION:	Request further inf. on relationship of stucco to exterior brick siding. Indicate exact type & finish of stucco. Erect stucco sample on site for approval prior to permit issuance, 2/16/68.	
156	1068-31st St., NW Mr & Mrs Edwin W. Davis	7' cedar sapling fence to form patio area.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 2/16/68.	

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
157	2901 M St., NW T. & J. Pedas	1-story masonry commercial bldg.

ACTION: Not recom'd. See action on Informal OG 68-113, 2/20/68.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

MAR 2 1 1968

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
149	3322 Dent Pl., NW Miss Lockwood	Brick sample. "Calvert" Sand Moulded Colonial Face Br. "Rose Full Range TK." Standard Size. Cushwa Br. & Bldg. Supply Co.

ACTION: Not recom'd. for "CALVERT" Sand Moulded Colonial Face Brick, "Rose Full Range TK" brick sample. See action on OG 68-160, 2/27/68.

150	3101 M St., NW Fred Astaire Dance Studio	Move sign located at 3107 M to above new address. s-f, 24.6 sq-ft sign was app'd. by CFA before installation at 3107 M St.

ACTION: Ret'd. without action pending disposition of non-conforming sign exist. on bldg., 3/7/68.

159	1530-30th St., NW John H. Schafer	Enclose porch & make two rms.

ACTION: No obj., 3/14/68.

160	3322 Dent Pl., NW Grace S. Lockwood	Brick Samples: "CALVERT" Sand Moulded Colonial Face Brick. Rose Red Range TK. Cushwa Br. & Bldg. Supply Co. Oxford Victorian Pink Colonials. Alwine Brick Co.

ACTION: Recom'd. for Rose Red Range TK Brick, Cushwa Brick & Bldg. Supply Co., or Oxford Victorian Pink Colonial Brick, Alwine Brick Co., both with butt mortar joints. Request sample panel, not a part of actual constr., be constructed for inspection, 2/27/68.

161	1434 Wisc. Ave., NW Anthony Bredice	6' chain-link fence from storage bldg. to main bldg.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Substitute coupling or board fence for chain link. MAR 2 1 1968

162	3248 N St., NW Leo M. Bernstein	Sandblast brick in lieu of painting (Entire structure).

ACTION: No obj. to paint removal, provided brick surfaces & joints are not seriously eroded. This has to be watched closely if a sand blasting technique is used, 3/14/68.

NO OG 68-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
163	1068-31st St., NW Mr & Mrs Edwin W. Davis	For occupancy requested & permitted, to conform to Code, exterior must be incombustible. A system for doing this & still retain appearance of bldg. has been app'd. by Mr. D. R. Kinney, Deputy Dr. At same time I have shown heavy Victorian trim at door & window heads removed except for lower fascia & crown mould which I believe to be original.
ACTION: Recom'd., 2/27/68.		
164	3000 M St., NW Sinclair Refining Co.	6 s-f hanging signs. Gold ltrs. on black bckgd.
ACTION: Recom'd., 3/13/68.		
165	2710 "O" St., NW Mrs Ruth A. Paepcke	Veneer exterior of exist. frame dwelling with brick & change exist. doorway to window on front facade.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided brick, mortar & joint alignment match adjacent house, 3/14/68.		
166	3211 R St., NW Mr & Mrs John V. Mladek	Add living room, bedrm. & attic.
ACTION: No obj. to overall scheme, but recom. restudy of side entr. to more closely resemble character of exist. front entr., 3/14/68.		
167	1655 Wisc. Ave., NW Winston H. Wrenn	Alteration of main entr. & three 1st fl. windows.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest showwindow be to the original plane of the exist. window, MAR 2 1 1968		
Def. 168	1630 Avon Pl., NW Arthur Cotton Moore	New dwelling.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Character unsuitable to Old Georgetown area, MAR 2 1 1968		

15 March 1968

Dear General North:

This will confirm my telephone conversation with you on March 13th about the selection of Everett Du Pen as sculptor for the Utah Beach Memorial.

As you know, the Commission did not feel the material submitted by Mr. Du Pen was satisfactory, but they took no formal action pending my talking to Paul Thiry to see what his views were regarding the selection. Mr. Thiry knows Mr. Du Pen well and believes him to be a capable sculptor. He also prefers to work with somebody in Seattle so he can have close contact with the designer. With the assurance of Mr. Thiry's close supervision, the Commission approves the selection of Mr. Du Pen. However, we request that preliminary sketches of the designs be submitted to the Commission before going ahead with the final work.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Major General Thomas North
Secretary
American Battle Monuments Commission
Room 2018, Munitions Building
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D

MR. ATHERTON: Yes, that's right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good. I just wanted to be clear on who had come in. So I think you'd prefer that we're in closed session, wouldn't you. I mean, no press is in on it -- I'm sorry.

Well, we've got your drawings up, if you'll come over -- whoever is the spokesman.

MR. NES: Well, I'll explain my statement first.

Since last May or June, we have not only reconsidered the scheme but the program.

V. NEW BUSINESS

1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

American Institute of Architects

Headquarters Building - Revised Design

MR. NES: The program is smaller. The height has been limited to 70 feet and the garden increased, so I'll --

VOICE: A little louder.

MR. NES: The area too has been reduced from 130 to 110.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes. We have a program now. We are about 110,000 square feet gross in this building, which allowed us to reduce the height of the building to a maximum of 72 feet, measured on the mean point on 18th

EXHIBIT E

Street.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. GIURGOLA: In terms of attitude toward the site, we substantially had the same type of work on the periphery, on the edge of it, but we made some substantial change in terms of an approach to it.

We had an entrance from New York Avenue here, but you walk into the open space in a protected area and you come into a vestibule, which is the meeting of these two points, where you find the vertical connection with the elevator.

This is a large vestibule, a very high one, which reached the top of the building, as a matter of fact. It's a shaft top. On both sides these are allowed to have the rectangle space, the office space clear and modulated according to normal use, and flexible in this sense over here. But below, for the two floors adjacent to the garden here, we have the exhibit space, which occupies two stories, and between here the board room and the other facility of the AIA, which is not shown here, but a mezzanine above this level.

Here, in fact, we have exhibit space and a small arboretum in this direction, and some service in the back here for the exhibit.

This brings us somehow to a simple backdrop -- also,

that we try to have, in terms of language, anonymous -- non-rhythmical, in a way -- but with very narrow slots which represent the opening of the office space. While below, where we are closer to the opening, we have much more glass, which opens up to the exhibit space here on these two layers -- the vestibule, and also the board room and the auditorium on the site.

In terms of site, we let the wall of the old garden stay intact; and there's a faint line here which represents the line of the present building, so that we're having all our line, practically 10 feet, behind that line.

We still maintain a kind of vocabulary, let's say, for this recess, and a rather smooth surface, alternating a sheathing material, in which now we are working either with the brick again -- in which we are studying some possible alternative, let's say, because essentially this is a concrete structure and we'll have to find shelving for this facing material.

We're not on sure footing yet for that -- but either that or a granite -- which would be much more costly. But we still are interested in something that could somehow make essentially one place, at least, in terms of the court.

The vegetation is really much thicker, in general, and it wasn't shown over here. The arbor plot would be visible, and to this arcade apparently with this space

MRS. SAARINEN: When you say "granite," you mean red granite?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MRS. SAARINEN: That will be a garden, that wall? Glass over at the top?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes, it will be glass at the top. So, really, looking from here, there will be a great sense of light into this space, but it will be enclosed. It is an enclosed space outside.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Oh, I see. Over on the ground floor, though, is it enclosed?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes, the office. This line and the glass here. And the glass will be recessed so you can walk through here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where is the glass on that other wall? Oh, I see. It's stepping down.

MR. GIURGOLA: It's stepping down. While on top --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where is the entrance to that thing? Is that on the front?

MRS. SAARINEN: Through that triangle.

MR. GIURGOLA: Through this garden there -- this would like to maintain because what happened for is this thing so that we stretch the front to the limit of the

present building, a little behind -- probably one or two feet behind -- and so that you come into an arcade and then you go in a particular place rather than being tangent to it.

We were afraid that once we moved the entrance -- before the entrance was here -- and once we moved the entrance to this corridor -- which in a way works very well in the way of servicing these two -- we were afraid that you'd never get to this entrance here. So at least you'd have the occasion to now.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do any members have any other questions?

Mrs. Smith, do you want to discuss before the Commission our general views? We've discussed it, of course, in private and there's unanimity in our position; but I think that Mrs. Smith can explain it and then other members can express their views, if you would lead off.

MRS. SMITH: First, we really thought that the location and the scales were really beautiful -- the playing up of the garden and the various separations -- and that as a mass that really it's much better -- not too high and it leaves the old building by itself.

We felt perhaps -- and I gather from what you said earlier -- that essentially this study was a mass and a planned study rather than a detailed study on the exterior, what materials and so on. And at this point we felt that

CHAIRMAN MARTIN: No, only members have any questions?

Mrs. Smith, do you want to discuss before the Commission our general views? We've discussed it, of course, in private and there's unanimity in our position, but I think that Mrs. Smith can explain it and then others can express their views, if you would like to.

MRS. SMITH: First, we really support the location and the zoning were really beautiful -- the building, as a whole that nearly it's much better -- but we might be losing the old building by taking it down.

We felt perhaps -- and I spoke from some real worlds -- that essentially this study was a more in a planned study rather than a rushed study on the ordinance, what materials and so on. And at this point it's even more difficult -- and so that you come into an unused and then -- in a parliamentary place another thing happens to it, -- during the interval my part -- and most of several the questions to this ordinance -- which is a very minor one well in the way of applying those two -- so that already since you'd never get to this ordinance here. So we found [illegible] have the occasion to now.

these were just an indication of some kind of thinking. But the main point of today's discussion was the basic mass and the separation from the old building. Every one felt that that was desirable, and lower scale and so on; and we didn't quite understand many things about the exterior, but we did realize that this was just a very preliminary thing and very good a job; and that is our general feeling.

The old house is quite comfortable with that space in the back. So we weren't prepared to really discuss the exterior. We didn't know what materials or what you were doing. So I think our feeling was that as far as the basic location and mass, we were pleased with that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft?

MR. BUNSHAFT: We were worried about these striped windows. Are you happy with all the details of the outside yourself? You know, you changed it quite radically.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

Well, you know, this might be in the discussion. We really believe that the direction to take is to try to have an obstruct, sort of background. I mean, ideally, it would be a plain wall, but that is not what we want; and we are afraid of, you see, a rhythm.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Afraid of what?

MR. GIURGOLA: A rhythm. Every time we decided to start with windows and opening a modular structure and so

on, we came up with this kind of thing -- something more fluid that we were trying to obtain with this horizontal window -- which are really in intersection here. They are supposed to be heavy spandrel, which also protects the glass behind.

The first intention is the glass behind, so that it would take care somehow of this situation and become a sort of shield of some sort, so that really the window goes into it. There would be a sense of space behind. But this is something that is still being calibrated in terms of dimension.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think this idea of a court -- you know, what you're really trying to do here is get two wings.

These are the elevators?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So that you go this way or this way.

MR. GIURGOLA: Right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Maybe it could be strengthened by opening it up this way. I don't know. I mean, it's an interesting idea. I don't think we're all too happy with the exterior. To me, it seems -- to us, I think, not me -- there seems to be too many motifs or you weren't sure.

You know, if you got by this phase, you'd really

develop it yourself.

I don't know if that's true or not.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I thought maybe, you know, it's a part. Then you'd polish it.

MR. GIURGOLA: This is really a first study to see your reaction.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes.

MR. GIURGOLA: And about this one, what we didn't want to do is build that wing. So by doing that, by digging into it, we --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, dig in more. That's what I'm saying. Make it almost two wings.

It seems an interesting idea but it seems a little weak.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: And confusing where the two join. That whole area there is just confusing. I don't know that anyone would ever find the entrance.

MR. GIURGOLA: Well, this is an early study. We had the notion of arriving from here, the entrance door on this side. We now have this sort of indication of the possible structure, but it is essentially in this direction that the entrance will develop.

We would like to get into it by covered walk.

MRS. SMITH: Will you be able to enter from 18th --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, there's an entrance to the auditorium over there.

MRS. SMITH: Is the court wall over there on 11th or can you just walk in there from there?

MR. GIURGOLA: From here?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes.

MR. GIURGOLA: Well, we don't have now an entrance from here. It would be a secondary action for the auditorium. We didn't envision that, although, again, this is something -- you see, we will have a service approach here, with a loading platform for the business area here.

MRS. SMITH: Not the area between the warehouse and the auditorium. That is all open.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

Here's a sketch which sort of shows that. This would be the gate open to the property.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MRS. SMITH: Then coming in here, will you know how to get -- I mean, will you see the entrance to one side?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes. This action.

MR. SHEIK: Chloethiel, could I ask you a question?

MRS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHEIK: This concerns me a little bit about this here -- whether we should have a provision for this

garden to be closed off at night, whether we should have a control here at this point.

MR. WALKER: We should.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's an absolute must, I would think.

MRS. SMITH: Also, for the entrance from New York Avenue, I would just have the whole wall.

MR. SHEIK: There's the question of vandalism there, I think.

This is all open, you know.

MRS. SMITH: I know. This is why I was asking. I would like to see a total wall so you know the whole entrance, you can see where it is. You can have a little door to get out, but I think it would make the courtyard better if it's all closed up.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Saarinen, do you have any remarks?

MRS. SAARINEN: No. I would assume that the decision of the exterior material would certainly influence the detailing of this. Therefore, you know, that would influence the ceiling.

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I say something?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think the mass and size -- you know, I think it's actually smaller than the subject

MRS. SMITH: I know. That is why I was waiting.
This is all open, you know.
Sure, I think.
MR. SMITH: There's the question of vandalism.
Avenue. I would just have the whole wall.
MRS. SMITH: Also, for the [illegible] from the
CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's an excellent [illegible]
MR. WALTON: We should.
control here at this point.
garden to be closed off at night, whether or should [illegible]
CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. [illegible], do you have any
remarks?
MRS. JANSZEN: No. I would simply like to
decline of the asphalt mixing [illegible]
the detailing of this. Therefore, you know, they would
influence the vehicle.
MR. SHERRY: May I [illegible]
CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.
MR. SHERRY: I think the main area -- you
know, I think it's [illegible] than the existing

actually looks. Seventy feet high isn't actually very high, is that what you're saying?

MR. SHAIK: Seventy-two feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So it's really quite a small building, and I personally think the idea of getting a court up there, separating the two wings, could be very interesting.

I have a feeling it needs a great deal of study, which I'm sure you would do in developing it because I think that there seems to be a few too many little tricks there.

Like the entrance -- even though it should be irregular and peculiar, it really isn't quite strong enough. You know this one wall there. I don't know what you do with it on the upper floors.

Is that a little office on every floor up above?

But, anyhow, you know, I have a feeling, once you get by this stage, you'll really go to work on it yourself.

Are you happy with this? Would you take the working drawings on this if you had an O.K.?

MR. GIURGOLA: Oh, no.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So I think this building ought to be concrete and gray and go with the neighborhood -- or granite. I don't think it ever ought to be brick. The way you're working with this it's never brick, and there's no

use kicking about it.

And the AIA has a lot of money; it ought to be granted.

If you want to separate it from the old building, it could be gray, but it is not brick. There's no use talking about this design or any design. You know they're brick or they're concrete buildings.

MR. GIURGOLA: Our concern was color, you know, or the kind of surface which is warm and is part of a place.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Also, concrete. These really look like concrete to us.

MR. SAARINEN: Let that be a lesson.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But I think this is the approach.

MR. SHEIK: You're pretty well pleased with that garden area, aren't you? We are.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh, yes.

MRS. SAARINEN: Andthe little garden has breathing space now.

How do you feel about it now? Do you still prefer the other scheme?

MR. GIURGOLA: No, also because we were very enthusiastic about the general attitude of the other building; but I feel equally, you know, for this. And to an architect it's a smaller building, substantially.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You get quite powerful in the elements

MR. GLENDOLF: Our company was organized for the kind of business which is meant and in case of a fire, or theft, or burglary, then we pay the loss. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the report.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But I think this is the unanimous.

MR. SHANTMAN: Let that be a lesson.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Or, I'm sorry, Mr. Glendolf, I'm sorry.

MR. GLENDOLF: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the report.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Or, I'm sorry.

MR. SHANTMAN: Let that be a lesson.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But I think this is the unanimous.

MR. SHANTMAN: You're perfectly right. Anyone who wants to change it, speak now or forever hold your peace.

How do you feel about it now? Do you still

that you have if you just hit a few of them.

I think it would be a strong building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Lemon Building --

MR. BUMSHAFT: You could have parties in there and it could be really outdoor living in the spring here; and it ought to be thought of as a room, you know, so that you close it off somehow or other.

MR. GIURGOLA: Perhaps a wall.

MR. BUMSHAFT: Well, I don't know how.

MR. NES: Well, after studying it the general concept remains the same and we come up with horizontality for the office floors, would you look with great disfavor on that, because we'd be quite a long at that time?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, not at all.

MR. WALKER: Wait a minute. That's the one thing that makes me unhappy.

MRS. SMITH: It seems too strong to me. If it could just be quieter -- the scale. The garden, I think, is also nice, but somehow it just is a long horizontal. I just don't happen to like horizontal --

MR. GIURGOLA: Well, we certainly have to build models and things to really get into the spirit.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. GIURGOLA: Now, a suggestion to indicate that we would like to have this sized building.

MRS. SMITH: It seems too obvious to me. It
could just be quicker -- the route. Like [illegible]. I mean
[illegible] the shortest [illegible]
[illegible] reason to take Derleth[illegible] --

MR. CARLSON: Well, we [illegible]
[illegible] one thing to really get into the [illegible].

CHAIRMAN WATSON: Yes.

MR. CARLSON: How's [illegible] to [illegible]
we would like to have [illegible] consider.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think you solve that inner court and how these things come in. I think if you take that corridor as some sort of thing -- which I think would be fun -- you know, the people could have their light there -- I think you'd get lots of activity in the bottom -- sculptural activity. I think that the bottom part could be simpler without that horizontal.

I don't know how you make it simpler but I don't think this is solved here. I think either this develops bigger or there's more separation or something.

I don't know, but if that were stronger then this would make it simpler and you'd get your sculptural quality here and then that corner may lead to a lot of exciting things for that whole project and give us a special meaning.

MRS. SMITH: I'm a little concerned with those ears on the avenue, on New York Avenue, that I --

MR. GIURGOLA: Well, this is -- there is always a desire to make --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: One conversation at a time.

MR. GIURGOLA: If this is smooth and turned around, this is a different kind of situation in terms of space. This would sort of start to get into these things and -- no: I think this is the point -- that we have office space on top and we have to talk with the simplicity given by this

inner thing -- I mean, the space that is inside -- so that we will have a simple kind of situation over here versus the more complex auditorium.

MRS. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Maybe what we're all saying is that the sculptural quality down below is weakened by these small deep recesses. I think that's what we're saying.

MR. SHEIK: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How do you do it? I don't know. But I think if your sculptural qualities were down below, even if that's indicated, even if that was a little saw-tooth or something -- I don't know, maybe little holes -- it's something.

Well, anyhow --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I think that we've made great progress. We thank you for coming.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think if you're going to come in again, if you get a design you like, maybe you ought to bring it in without making big model stuff. When you think you have your final design, it might be nice to see it again without that stage.

What do you think?

MR. GIURGOLA: Fine. This would be perfect.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good. Agreed. Thank you so much.

S.L. 68-37 1735 New York Ave., N.W.

American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building

Action: Returned for further study. Site plan, massing, and height of building are generally acceptable. Exterior elevations are disapproved. They appear unresolved, especially at the intersection of the two wings. Also other elements such as the exaggerated horizontal window bands and the prow-like extensions on the end walls were questioned. Stress a greater degree of unity in design of exterior. February 20, 1968

EXHIBIT E

MR. ATHERTON: Would you like us to bring that model over here on the table so we won't have to go around?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: O.K., sure. I

MR. ATHERTON: I don't think it's too heavy.

MR. BUNSHAFT: He's not happy with this either. He's just trying to get it over with.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, Gordon, since you've designed the subway so far, I think you might as well continue with the project!

(Laughter.)

You ought to make the presentation.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Gee, I hope they build it. I think it would be wonderful.

The Forum this month has a big article on subways and megastructures and I haven't read it. They talk about the Montreal --

(Individuals enter room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, St. Patrick's Day!

(Laughter.)

(Chairman Walton had referred to green necktie worn by individual.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: Think that's going to help?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, I don't see any reason for you to sit down, Harry. Are you tired?

MR. WEESE: All right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Do you want to say anything?

MR. WEESE: No.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're so happy with that station up there that we don't want you to change a thing.

MR. WEESE: Good.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Are you going to have that red tile like that on the floor?

MR. WEESE: Yes. Dark brown. We'd like to have an octagon or hexagon pattern if we can get it because it has to fit into so many different shapes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's nice. This drawing here -- you know, that section of your model over here?

MR. WEESE: Oh, yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The curve on the photograph falls back under the tracks. Does it do it here?

MR. WEESE: It does to some degree, but this is a two-story wall and it doesn't come back quite so much under because the track is there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All right, that's beautiful. What's next?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. The surface station.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All right. Two things I'd like to ask.

MR. WEESE: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You know, you have this apron hanging down. That's to let the light in while the trains are in position?

MR. WEESE: That's also to keep the weather off.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes; but I mean if the train is here (drawing sketch) -- excuse my bad drawing -- and this comes up, why can't you just have this arch lower and not have this apron, and then some detail to get your light thrown up on there?

MR. WEESE: It would lower the space. The volume would get less. In other words, it would get to be a pretty low thing. You're either lowering the whole thing or else coming back down.

MRS. SMITH: Couldn't it just turn around? Who's going to wash all these is my question.

(Laughter.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: Can you see the end? The end is lower. This is high. If you get an equal arch, you know, and get from this point, and maybe have the arch a little stronger, is it the same as that?

What we'd like to see is -- get down here. This is going to get dirty, we think; and, also, it seems to us, it would be stronger to conform. In fact, it might even be stronger if this support here was horizontal, the top of it; and it might even be fun then, you know, to get it down here,

MR. SHERMAN: Yes sure, you have been quoted hanging down. That's so far the Right to walk the house as one in position?

MR. MANN: That's also to keep the members off.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes; but I mean if the House is there (drawing diagram) -- assume Mr and Dunning -- and they come up, why can't you just have both seats lower and have this space, and then some detail to put your chair shown up on there?

MR. MANN: It would lower the space. The volume would get less. In other words, he would get to be a pretty low unit. You're always lowering the whole thing to walk back down.

MRS. KLINE: Couldn't it just turn around? She's going to wear all three in my question.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHWARTZ: Can you see the side? You can't lower. This is right. If you put in usual arch, you can and get from this point, and maybe down the room a little anyway. Is it the same as that?

What we'd like to see is -- put down here. But is going to get dirty, we think and, since is inside it would be attorney to welcome. In fact, it might run to another if this support here underneath, the top of it and it might even be fun seat, you know. So if it was just

because we think you could get enough light.

MR. WEESE: You don't think you'd get enough dark crevasses? You knew that the light was here?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Wait a minute, he's got something.

MR. WEESE: We were thinking of mirror glass for the sun, and also because of the outside you have a silver streak there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It wouldn't make any difference for people inside except to cut the glare, but it would be good for people looking in.

MR. WEESE: I mean the reflected --

MR. BUNSHAFT: The mirror would be on the outside in the nighttime and then in the nighttime every single little bulb -- you'd see it in that mirror, probably. I don't know.

MRS. SAARINEN: But, Harry, we can't even wash this off.

MR. WEESE: Would you come farther out?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes. Have it in one form, Harry.

MRS. SAARINEN: The light would reflect back up in here even more, because you'd have that surface there. You'd do away with glass and the maintenance problem.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What we're saying is one mode.

MR. WEESE: One material too.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And while we're on that, the other thing -- and that's the column. You know, I can just -- we ought to have a square one going at right angles and say, "This is quite boring and turn at 45."

I think what we all felt here is probably an expression of this thing -- it would be a rectangle going in the direction of this, really. And it could be interesting It could go in this direction but could flare this way, but to fit in as a rectangle because really that's what it is.

It could be a rectangle that might be an elevation this way, with the thing going that way.

I think it would be more interesting --

MR. WEESE: All right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: -- because this looks disjointed, the trains. All right.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What have you done about the air-conditioning ducts?

MR. WEESE: Well, we're still up to our ears on that. We still haven't got an answer for you on that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That red that you have in that rendering is beautiful. That red with all this gray --

MRS. SAARINEN: Well, you'd have that outside too?

"This is quite boring and there is no [illegible]
to begin to have a figure one [illegible] and [illegible]
thing -- who needs one column. I'm home. I can [illegible]

I think what we all [illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible] of this thing -- it would be a [illegible]
in the direction of this, really. And it could be [illegible]
It could go in this direction but could [illegible] west to
to fit in as a [illegible] because really that's what it
[illegible] It would be a [illegible] that might be an [illegible]
this way, with the thing going that way.

I think it would be more [illegible] --

MR. [illegible] All right.

MRS. [illegible] -- because this [illegible]
the [illegible]. All right.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN WATKINS: Does [illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible]?

MS. [illegible]: Well, we're still [illegible] the
time. We still haven't got an answer for [illegible] the
[illegible]. There [illegible] were [illegible]
[illegible] is beautiful. Those [illegible] with [illegible] --

MRS. [illegible]: Well, could [illegible] [illegible]

MR. WEESE: Oh, yes; everywhere.

MRS. SAARINEN: We like the little lights.

MR. WEESE: The what?

MRS. SAARINEN: The little lights are nice.

We also like the way you have the rectangular column.

MR. WEESE: Well, we always felt, you know, this rectangular column was expendable.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Extendable or expendable?

MR. WEESE: Both!

(Laughter.)

Do you see any problems with it? I think this would be less cost.

VOICE: I defer to your explanation.

MR. WEESE: Well, we have to go away now and think about what we did!

(Laughter.)

If it comes down quite close to the train, we still would be able to keep this height --

MRS. SAARINEN: It's not going to come any closer to the train. It will come out farther that way, but it's not going to come down any more. The light will be there and you'd get, really, better shelter because the angle is better.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're not going to have trains;

MR. WILSON: Well, we always felt, just speaking, that a
rectangular column was acceptable.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Acceptable or appropriate?

MR. WILSON: Both.

(Laughter.)

Do you see any problems with it? I mean even
would be less cost.

VOICE: I don't see any objections.

MR. WARNER: Well, we have to be sure that they
means what we say!

(Laughter.)

If it comes down to that other choice to use steel, we
still would be able to keep this height --

MRS. SAARINEN: It's not going to come out right.
We like the rectangular. It will come out perfect that way, but it's
not going to come down any more. The Jones will be there
and you'd get, really, rather shallow beams the other
way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're not going to find that
out.

MR. WILSON: Well, we always felt, just speaking, that a
rectangular column was acceptable.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Acceptable or appropriate?

MR. WILSON: Both.

(Laughter.)

Do you see any problems with it? I mean even
would be less cost.

VOICE: I don't see any objections.

MR. WARNER: Well, we have to be sure that they
means what we say!

(Laughter.)

If it comes down to that other choice to use steel, we
still would be able to keep this height --

MRS. SAARINEN: It's not going to come out right.
We like the rectangular. It will come out perfect that way, but it's
not going to come down any more. The Jones will be there
and you'd get, really, rather shallow beams the other
way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're not going to find that
out.

we're just going to have a subway!

(Laughter.)

MRS. SAARINEN: It would be a very nice place to go!

(Laughter.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: Why don't we make the trains red, later or now? Gee, they ought to be red.

MR. WEESE: There are the aesthetics of the idea, but that subject hasn't come up yet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, seriously, what about red trains?

MRS. SMITH: Red is beautiful.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Let's start all over again. Would the trains be submitted to the Fine Arts Commission?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There's no precedent for this whatsoever.

(Laughter.)

We're open to the whims of the MATA.

MR. WEESE: Well, without committing anybody, we're very sympathetic to it. The train is an exciting thing.

Red would certainly do it. Otherwise, it gets pretty bland, if you just have a silver blend or a dirty aluminum train.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Nowadays, on the train that's

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, we have a motion.

CHAIRMAN PARTON: There's no [illegible] from the
theatre be extended to the Pine Bend Commercial Hi[illegible]

MR. BENNETT: Let's start all over again. Would
anyone be opposed to this?

(Laughter.)

We're open to the wishes of the public.

CHAIRMAN PARTON: There's no [illegible] from the
audience.

(Laughter.)

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
[illegible] a motion.

MR. HANSEN: It would be a very good idea, I
think.

(Laughter.)

MR. BENNETT: Why don't we make that motion?

Later on now? Gee, that ought to be real.

MR. WILSON: There was the [illegible] of the
[illegible] but that hasn't done us any.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. [illegible] what about the
[illegible]

MRS. OWENS: Read it beautiful.

MR. BENNETT: Let's start all over again. Would
anyone like to make a motion?

(Laughter.)

We're open to the wishes of the public.

MR. [illegible]: Well, perhaps [illegible]
motion.

We're very disappointed to see that there is no [illegible]
anything.

Had hoped especially to [illegible], Chairman, if
[illegible] Pond have a silver cloud or a [illegible]
[illegible] plaque, if you just have a silver cloud or a [illegible]
[illegible] trail.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, we have a motion.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

(Laughter.)

MR. BENNETT: I'd move that we close the hearing.

MR. HANSEN: It would be a very good idea, I
think.

(Laughter.)

MR. BENNETT: Why don't we make that motion?

Later on now? Gee, that ought to be real.

MR. WILSON: There was the [illegible] of the
[illegible] but that hasn't done us any.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. [illegible] what about the
[illegible]

MRS. OWENS: Read it beautiful.

MR. BENNETT: Let's start all over again. Would
anyone like to make a motion?

(Laughter.)

We're open to the wishes of the public.

MR. [illegible]: Well, perhaps [illegible]
motion.

We're very disappointed to see that there is no [illegible]
anything.

Had hoped especially to [illegible], Chairman, if
[illegible] Pond have a silver cloud or a [illegible]
[illegible] trail.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, we have a motion.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

outdoors, that would be mirror glass?

MR. WEESE: That would be mirror glass, because that's the new technology. It would be the laminated stuff.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Oh, the laminated stuff.

MR. WEESE: And, again, at night, in the tunnel, you just see the dark going by. You really see it with this one if it's mirrored, because on the outside you can't see if anybody is riding on the train or not -- which is very good for business!

(Laughter.)

MRS. SAARINEN: You don't know which car to get into!

(Laughter.)

MR. WEESE: These all have to be mocked up, but the Berlin cars are the most exciting ones to me; and they're red and yellow, beautifully kept. It's glossy enamel over steel, like an automobile -- just the same automobile finish.

MRS. SAARINEN: Fire red!

(Laughter.)

MR. WEESE: If you had another color it would have to be so that when you open the train the inside color works with it. And it would be a wonderful thing on these designs where we have a neutral floor. And a neutral floor calls for no traffic at the moment!

MR. WEBSTER: Then would be a wonderful thing to share. Let's see how many we have a memorial floor. And a memorial floor with it. And it would be a wonderful thing to share. It would be so that when you open the front the inside color would be to reflect at the moment!

(Laughter.)

MRS. BRADSHAW: Sure would!

MR. WEBSTER: If you had plumbing colors it would have been a different color. Like an automobile -- just the same automobile paid and yellow, beautifully kept. It's pretty unusual color, Dublin care are the most exciting cars to me, and they're great for business!

(Laughter.)

MR. SEARLES: You don't know which one to get into!

(Laughter.)

MR. WEBSTER: There all have to be painted up, but the one if anybody is making on that truck or not -- making the very one that one would be nice, because on the color just red, just saw the dark green or. Then would see it on the

MR. MEYER: Yes, again, it might, in the front.

MR. WEBSTER: In the Lawrence city.

MR. MEYER: Then would be saying plenty, because that's the new community. It would be the insurance city.

MR. WEBSTER: Yes, that would be very nice.

(Laughter.)

It calls for a bit of excitement.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A dashing trend.

MR. VUNSHAFT: You need a bit of color.

MR. WEESE: It all sounds on the right track.

MRS. SMITH: To coin a phrase!

(Laughter.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: Isn't America sort of blue, you know? I mean, you could get a real rich blue.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Eastern Airlines has a combination of two blues. And the comfort that we put into the mobile lounges -- remember that red?

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You walk into American Airlines and the whole carpet is red. It makes the whole place look nice.

MRS. SMITH: The Kennedy Center is all red. I had to sit through a presentation the other day and the whole damn thing is red.

MR. WALKER: Gordon is on the side. Shush!

(Laughter.)

MR. ROSZAK: In terms of the brown, blue would really be the thing to use.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, anyhow, where do you want these mailed? Will bright-color samples be mailed?

(Laughter.)

is quite for a bit of excitement.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A reading event.

MR. VONNEGUT: You need a bit of acting.

MS. [illegible]: It fit nicely on the night [illegible].

MRS. SMITH: To join a phone?

(Laughter.)

MR. BURNHART: Isn't Imperial area of mine, you know?

I mean, you could get a real nice place.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Lastly, Allyllen has a combination of two plans. And the committee that we put into the motion spoke -- remember that red?

MR. [illegible]: Yes.

MS. DUNCANNON: You will into precious sleeping and the white corpse is red. It means the child-free [illegible].

MRS. [illegible]: The Kennedy Center is [illegible].

to ask through a presentation the owner dog and the white [illegible] is red.

MR. MEMBER: Question to me the vote. [illegible]

(Laughter.)

MS. KOZAK: In terms of the second, they would [illegible] as the thing to use.

MR. BURNHART: Well, second, those in favor [illegible] Allyllen [illegible] motion to motion.

MR. WEESE: Well, we'd be glad to make the agency know of our feelings.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, this has been a happy session, don't you think?

MR. WEESE: It's been very happy!

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you.

MR. WEESE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good-bye.

(Individuals leave room.)

MR. WEBER: Well, we'd be glad to have you continue

know of our feelings.

CHAIRMAN WATSON: Well, this has been a lengthy

session, don't you think?

MR. WEBER: It's been very happy!

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN WATSON: Thank you.

MR. [illegible] Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WATSON: Mr. [illegible].

(Individuals leave room.)

tion of two plans. And the committee then we put into the

[illegible] -- Chairman Hoyt MAY

MRS. SARATHEW: Yes.

MR. DUNSHAPE: You want this Executive Adjusted

and the whole carpet is red. It makes the whole place look

nice.

MRS. SMITH: The Kennedy Center is all red. I

do all through a presentation the other day and the main

thing is red.

MR. WATKINS: Counsel is on one side. [illegible]

(Laughter.)

MR. MOSKAN: In terms of the budget, one would really

be the thing to use.

MR. DUNSHAPE: Well, I think, where it [illegible]

walled? With bright-color hangings or [illegible]

27 February 1968

Dear General Graham:

Enclosed is a transcript of our meeting last week in which the Commission reviewed stations at 12th and G and the aerial prototype station at Rhode Island Avenue.

To summarize briefly, the Commission approved the design of the 12th and G St. station, but suggested several changes in the details of the Rhode Island Avenue station, notably the elimination of the glass screen suspended from the roof over the train platform.

Also note that toward the end of the transcript there is a reference to the color of the trains. The Commission feels this would be a splendid opportunity to add excitement and distinction to the system.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Major General Jackson Graham
Director
Washington Metropolitan Area
Transit Authority
1634 Eye St., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT G²

20 March 1968

Dear Mr. Airis:

This will merely serve as a record of the Commission's disapproval of the south portal designs, center leg of the Inner Loop, which we considered at our February meeting.

The materials and lighting were disapproved because they represented a complete departure from the designs of the north end of the tunnel. On previous submissions the Commission has repeatedly emphasized the need for a highway system of unified design, meaning that in this instance it will be necessary to use the same materials, railings and lighting designs on both ends of the center leg tunnel.

I am enclosing a transcript of the discussion for your information.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director
D.C. Department of Highways
and Traffic
District Building
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT H

25 March 1968

Dear Mr. Knott:

This will merely serve as a record of the Commission's action at its February meeting on the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

The Commission approved the design of the building but questioned the proposed parking decks immediately adjacent on the south. We strongly recommend that the parking structure be lowered one more level thus eliminating the need for parking on the roof as now proposed.

This structure could then be planted in similar fashion to the parking facilities at the Defense Office Building at Bolling/Anacostia, which the Commission hopes will set a precedent for all other federal buildings in the future.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT I

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

WILLIAM WALTON, Chairman
GORDON BUNSHAFT — HIDEO SASAKI
THEODORE ROSZAK — CHLOETHIEL W. SMITH
ALINE B. SAARINEN — JOHN WALKER
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

20 March 1968

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Blaser:

This will merely serve as a record of the Commission's action on projects your office submitted at our February meeting.

1. Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas St., N.E.

Revised design was approved with the suggestion that the circulation between the kitchen and all-purpose room be improved. No further submission requested.

2. Capitol East Playground and Indoor Swimming Pool, 7th St. and North Carolina Avenue, S.E.

Proposed design was disapproved. Briefly the character of the building was oppressive, forbidding, and too much like a warehouse. The structural system was also poorly conceived. Request further study.

3. Fort Dupont Swimming Pool

Design approved provided that dormers and roof be simplified. No further submission requested.

4. Warehouse and Shops Building, Main Water Pumping Station, 2nd and Bryant Sts., N.W.

Design disapproved. Recommended that simple rectangular openings be incorporated throughout the building. A revised design has since been received and is approved.

I would be glad to go over any of these projects individually if you would like to be filled in on more details.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. James A. Blaser
Director, D.C. Department of
Buildings and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT A

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 February 1968

AM
10:15

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting:
   Executive Session: 19 March 1968
   Open Session: 20 March 1968

2. Approval of Minutes of January 1968 Meeting

3. Budget Hearings, Fiscal Year 1969

III. LEGISLATION

H.R. 15083-2/5/68-Mr.McMillan-90thC

To encourage and assist private industry to provide needed new parking facilities, employment opportunities, and housing units, and a strengthened and expanded tax base in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, pursuant to skyline studies for the National Capital Planning Commission in 1964, and parking studies for the Bureau of the Budget to provide needed parking facilities in the District of Columbia.

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

   a. American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

   b. S.L. 68-35, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., National Academy of Science Auditorium and Parking Lot - Proposed Design

   c. S.L. 68-33, 30 E Street, S.W., Addition to Chesapeake and Potomac Communications Center - Proposed Design

   d. S.L. 68-34, 2500 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Add Canopy to Existing Penthouse Roof (Watergate East)

   e. Appendix 1 - Shipstead-Luce Act Submissions

f. Appendix 2 - Old Georgetown Act Submissions

g. O.G. 68-157, 2901 M St., N.W. - Proposed Design of Market and Theater

2. D. C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

South Portal and Approaches to Inner Loop Center Leg Tunnel - Proposed Design

3. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Washington Subway System:

a. 12th and G Streets Transfer Station

b. Concept for Aerial Stations (Rhode Island Ave. on the B&O right of way)

4. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas St., N.E. - Revised Design

b. Capitol East Playground and Natatorium, Seventh St. and North Carolina Ave., S.E. - Proposed Design

c. Fort Dupont Swimming Pool - Proposed Design

d. Warehouse and Shops Building, Main Water Pumping Station, 2nd and Bryant Sts., N.W. - Proposed Design

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Services

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design

6. American Battle Monuments Commission

Proposed selection of Everett Du Pen as sculptor for Utah Beach Memorial

V. INTERVIEWS

11:30 1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

12:00 2. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Washington Subway System:

a. 12th and G Streets Transfer Station

b. Concept for Aerial Stations (Rhode Island Ave. on the B&O right of way)

LUNCH

2:30 3. D. C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

S.L. 68-35, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., National Academy of Science Auditorium and Parking Lot - Proposed Design

2:45 4. D. C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

South Portal and Approaches to Inner Loop Center Leg Tunnel - Proposed Design

3:00 5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design

3:15 6. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. Elementary School, Lincoln Road and Douglas St., N.E. - Revised Design

b. Capitol East Playground and Natatorium, Seventh St. and North Carolina Ave., S.E. - Proposed Design

c. Fort Dupont Swimming Pool - Proposed Design

d. Warehouse and Shops Building, Main Water Pumping Station, 2nd and Bryant Sts., N.W. - Proposed Design